DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 312 FL 001 045

By-Marckwardt, Albert H.

Opportunity and Obligation.

Pub Date Jul 64

Note-13p.; Address read to the Linguistic Society of America, New York, December 28, 1962.

Journal Cit-Language; v40 n3 p26-37 Jul-Sep 1964

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75

Descriptors-Applied Linguistics, Curriculum Development, *Educational Objectives, *English (Second Language), Federal Programs, Language Research, Language Role, *Linguistics, Modern Language Curriculum, *Modern Languages, Organizations (Groups), *Professional Associations, Teacher Education

Identifiers-Linguistic Society of America

This presidential address sketches the development of the Linguistic Society of America since 1924, indicates the motives for its formation, and surveys its progress, status, and impact in the field of linguistics, both in the lay and scholarly spheres. The organization's role in the study of foreign languages, English, and English as a second language is stressed, and supporting statistics are provided. In conclusion it is suggested that the group focus less attention on research than on pedagogical and curricular matters involved in fostering the growth of linguistics and related studies. (JH)

EDO 24312

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

OPPORTUNITY AND OBLIGATION

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT
Princeton University

Reprinted from LANGUAGE
Vol. 40, No. 3, (Part 2), July–September, 1964
Printed in U.S.A

FL 001 045

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Editor, Language
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Reprinted from LANGUAGE
Vol. 40, No. 3, (Part 2), July-September, 1964
Printed in U.S.A.

OPPORTUNITY AND OBLIGATION*

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT
Princeton University

I must beg your indulgence for departing this evening from a practice of long standing in the Linguistic Society, namely the presentation of what has generally been essentially a research paper as the presidential address. It was only with some hesitation that I decided to depart from tradition, but I feel that as an organization we are confronted with a situation that is at once so urgent and so compelling that it must be called to the attention of the membership.

May I ask you first to follow me in a rapid sketch of the growth and development of this association and the profession it represents, as it has occurred over the past thirty-eight years. On December 28, 1924, a group of 69 assembled in New York City, at the American Museum of Natural History. In the course of two brief sessions they organized themselves into the Linguistic Society of America, elected a slate of officers, appointed two standing committees, resolved to apply for admission as a constituent society of the American Council of Learned Societies, established a policy of rotation with respect to annual meetings, and listened to four learned papers. Miss Hahn is recorded as having commented on the first of the papers.

The motives for forming the new society were clearly stated in the *Call* for the organizational meeting: 'The existing learned societies have shown hospitality to linguistics; they have patiently listened to our papers and generously printed them ... Nevertheless, the present state of things has many disadvantages. The most serious, perhaps, is the fact that we do not meet. We attend the gatherings of such societies as the American Philological Association, the American Oriental Society, the Modern Language Association ..., the American Anthropological Association, and so on. This divides us into groups across whose boundaries there is little acquaintance. No one can tell how much encouragement and inspiration is thereby lost.' And there was still another highly significant sentence: 'The standing of our science in the academic community leaves much to be desired.'[1]

In his prefatory essay to the first volume of *Language*, entitled 'Why a Linguistic Society?', Leonard Bloomfield dealt with this latter point in a somewhat less restrained fashion. 'It would be superfluous to speak also of external conditions which add to our justification,' he wrote, 'were it not that these conditions are working great injury to the progress of our science and to the welfare of the public at large. Not only in the general public but also in the academic system, linguistics is not known as a science. The notion seems to prevail that a student of language is merely a kind of crow-baited student of literature. Even the most personal and at first glance petty ill-effects of this situation are not always to be lightly dismissed. Unfortunately an instance lies at hand in the recent death of

* Presidential address read to the Linguistic Society of America in New York on 28 December 1962; here printed by order of the Executive Committee.

[1] 'The call for the organization meeting', *Lg.* 1.6 (1925).

Carlos Everett Conant, one of our founders, the foremost student of Philippine languages; he died tragically and the circumstances of his death indicate that he might have been spared, to the great benefit of science, had not his professional career been one of desperate hardship."[2] In short, the two principal motives which actuated our founding were a feeling of the need for communication across existing disciplinary boundaries and the desire for recognition of linguistic studies as a professional entity.

The infant organization was healthy at birth; it grew lustily. Within three months after its establishment there were 264 Foundation Members, and by the time the society had convened at Chicago for its second annual meeting, the membership had grown to 322—a number not very far above our present annual increment in any one year. There would be little point in a detailed recapitulation of the progress of the society from infancy through adolescence to maturity, although I trust that the important task of writing its history will not be neglected until the time when not a single Foundation Member will remain to serve as a firsthand source of information. It will suffice to say that our membership has increased six or seven fold, as has the attendance at annual meetings. We now find it difficult to select, from among the many papers offered, those which are to be read. Whether we like it or not, and I know that many will not, the day is not too far off when we shall be forced into meeting in concurrent sessions.

No account of the society's growth and vigor would be complete without some mention of the Linguistic Institute. It, too, had a small beginning, meeting for the first time in New Haven in 1928, offering a total of thirty-two courses, taught by a faculty of twenty-three, to a total student body of fifty-two. After three more attempts, in New Haven in 1929 and New York in 1930 and 1931, the project was abandoned until 1936, when Charles C. Fries conceived the idea of making it an integral part of a graduate summer program rather than a miniature institute for advanced studies. The pattern of expansion of the institutes generally parallels that of the society as a whole, except that it is not unusual for attendance at the summer meeting, held in conjunction with the Linguistic Institute, to rival and even surpass that of the winter sessions.

Let me assure you that I place no particular value upon this essentially quantitative presentation except to make the point that we have attained full maturity, and as Chaucer said of Madame Eglantyne, we may say of ourselves, 'For hardily [we are] not undergrowe.'

So much for the society. Now what of the profession it represents? Again, a history of the discipline as it developed in this country is unfortunately lacking, but upon rereading the list of Signers of the Call, I believe I am safe in saying that not one of them had a degree in what we would consider linguistics. There were anthropologists, classicists, orientalists, Germanists, Anglists, and Romance philologists—but no linguists. Moreover, in the list of 264 Foundation Members which, for those with academic positions, indicates the subjects they taught, *Linguistics* appears after only three names. Bloomfield was one of these. The other two taught in religious seminaries. It is of incidental interest to note that even at that time our interdisciplinary appeal extended beyond anthropology,

[2] Leonard Bloomfield, 'Why a Linguistic Society?', *Lg.* 1.4 (1925).

English, and the ancient and modern languages. Included among the founding fathers were two psychologists, one speech correctionist, one philosopher, and a dean of educational method.[3]

We must ask now where, as a profession, we are today. According to a survey made recently by the Center for Applied Linguistics, admittedly only a partial listing, it is possible to work for the master's degree in linguistics at twenty-one institutions, for the doctorate at seventeen. Ten schools offer an undergraduate program, a decided falling off in numbers from those with graduate curricula.[4] This will engage our attention later on.

Another way of measuring the present status in the field is in terms of the number of doctoral degrees which have been granted recently. The Center for Applied Linguistics received recently from the National Science Foundation a list of doctor's degrees in linguistics awarded in the United States during the five years 1957–61 inclusive. The total usually surprises those who hear it for the first time. It is 183. These 183 degrees were granted by thirty-three different institutions, virtually twice as many as the partial CAL survey lists as having doctoral programs in linguistics. It must be conceded, however, that the fifteen institutions not on the Center's list as offering doctoral programs awarded only twenty of the 183 degrees. What is perhaps more to the point is that 96 of them came from just five universities.

Also worthy of note is that both in 1960 and in 1961, 48 degrees were awarded, compared with 18 in 1957. To summarize our progress in the past four decades, it is fair to say that both master's and doctoral programs in linguistics have achieved a firm footing in the universities. At least nine institutions are turning out on an average from two to five Ph.D.s annually, and twenty-four others produce an occasional one or two. There is a steady increase in numbers, year by year, and unquestionably the number of master's degrees awarded annually would be two to three times as large, somewhere between one hundred and one hundred and fifty. The undergraduate major in linguistics is lagging when compared with the phenomenal growth of the graduate program.

Nor should I leave this part of my subject without calling your attention to the fact that in a certain sense the figure of 183 doctorates represents only a partial count. In many universities it is possible to get a degree in one of the language departments, in English, at times in a College of Education. Such a doctorate may represent a considerable amount of training in linguistics, and the candidate may have undertaken to work on a linguistic problem for his dissertation. Degrees of this kind, linguistic though they are in essence, would have been awarded by some other department and thus would not have been caught in the chattering jaws of the NSF computer. I have no figures from other departments to offer as a basis of comparison, but we are probably rivalling in numbers the graduate student population of many language departments, a remarkable growth for a period of less than forty years.

Yet, one must measure the force of a profession not in sheer numbers but rather

[3] List of members 1925, *Lg.* 2.78–93 (1926).

[4] *Linguistics and the teaching of English as a second language*, Center for Applied Linguistics (Washington, 1962).

in terms of what it does, the need for its services which has been created and which is being felt. Here again we shall find it profitable to go back to Leonard Bloomfield's introductory essay in the first number of *Language*. After pointing out the urgency for what we would undoubtedly agree upon as falling into the category of pure research—the development of methods of linguistic description, the perfection of techniques of direct observation, the recording of hitherto unknown languages and neglected dialects, the more complete tracing of the historical development of various languages—he then turned his attention to the application of linguistics in a paragraph which reveals one side of his own interest as well as his dismay over a situation which then prevailed.

> To speak finally of the public interest, it is evident that a great and important, indeed the fundamental phase of our social life consists of linguistic activities, and that in particular, elementary education is largely linguistic. Yet such movements as that for English spelling-reform or for an international auxiliary language are carried on, in principle and to a great extent in practice, without the counsel of our science. Our schools are conducted by persons who, from professors of education down to teachers in the classroom, know nothing of the results of linguistic science, not even the relation of writing to speech or of standard language to dialect. In short, they do not know what language is, and in consequence waste years of every child's life and reach a poor result.[5]

To this he added a trenchant footnote, 'As to foreign language teaching, there are few schoolmen who realize that there is a large linguistic literature on this subject.'

Let me ask again, how far have we come in the last thirty-eight years? The key is to be found in Bloomfield's last sentence (excluding the footnote reference). When Bloomfield wrote, it was undoubtedly true that teachers and educational administrators, in secondary schools and colleges as well as at the elementary level, did not know what language is, but it was equally true that they did not know that they did not know. They were in a completely happy state of ignorance.

Today, many of them are still a long way from a basic knowledge of linguistic principles and a sophisticated attitude toward language matters, but they do know that there is a science of language, and they look toward it hopefully as a means of solving many of their teaching problems. Not infrequently they are inclined to expect more from it than it can possibly accomplish, but at any rate a favorable attitude and something of a commitment to linguistics is characteristic of large sectors of the English and the foreign language teachers.

The strength of this commitment is evident in the programs which have been established on a nationwide basis. It is assumed, for example, that a language and area center, operating under the provisions of Title VI-A of the National Defense Education Act, will teach one of the less well-known languages intensively, that this teaching will be linguistically oriented, and that in due time the student will take a course which sets forth the structure of that language in a way which we would accept as scientifically tenable. It is assumed, as well, that a summer or a year-round institute for high-school or elementary teachers of a foreign language will devote some time to a linguistic analysis of that language

[5] 'Why a Linguistic Society?', *Lg.* 1.4–5 (1925).

and the application of the analysis to problems of classroom teaching. Now that a similar movement in English is under way, the place of linguistics in courses for teachers of English is quite as firmly established as it is in the foreign-language field.

Consciously or unconsciously, we have succeeded in being highly persuasive over the past three or four decades. To me this is nothing short of a miracle when I stop to reflect on the public-relations ineptitude of some of our membership, as well as the sad fact that some of the most significant inroads upon the public consciousness may well have been made by those whom we might consider charlatans or second-raters at best. Nor should we overlook the existence of a dissident opposition who misunderstand our purposes and attitude, question or deny our claims, and hope that if linguistics and linguists are ignored over a sufficient period of time, they may disappear and the world would again be the comfortable place that it was before.

The impact of linguistics upon high school and college education, particularly in English, goes back almost as far as the organization of the Linguistic Society, but during the late twenties and early thirties it was an uphill struggle. The Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, developed during the war years, afforded another channel for the impact of linguistics, principally upon the teaching of the so-called exotic languages, and to a lesser degree indirectly upon the college teaching of the common foreign languages. Linguistics has played a large role in teaching English as a foreign language, almost from the very beginning of government involvement in the early forties. All these, however, are mere prologue to what has happened with stunning force and rapidity during the past five years and is bound to increase in magnitude.

From the time that the NDEA Institutes for teachers of foreign languages in the elementary and secondary schools were first conceived, there was never any question about the inclusion of linguistics in their curricula. This was done in many different ways: at times through a structure course in the target language or one which contrasted English and the target language, at times through a course which emphasized language laboratory techniques or other applications of linguistics to language teaching. The point is that linguistics is invariably there. Thus, within a space of three or four years, a demand for the services of sixty linguists every summer has arisen, to say nothing of the year-round institutes supported by the same subsection of Title VI.

Another outcome of the foreign-language section of the National Defense Education Act is to be found in the strengthening of existing language and area centers and the development of new ones. Proposals for such centers were subjected to the close scrutiny of those who believed that intensive courses in the languages of Asia, Africa, and eastern Europe must be linguistically oriented, and that in many instances the students should have a sufficient command of field techniques that they might make their own analyses. This has created a demand for linguists in an area quite different from that which concerns the elementary and secondary school teachers.

With respect to the teaching of English, the story is much the same. Last

summer there were twenty institutes for secondary teachers, supported by the College Entrance Examination Board through its Commission on English. In each of these institutes there was a course in the English language, taught by a linguist or by someone who passed for one, and it can be said that the average of competence was reasonably high. Although the coming year constitutes something of a hiatus in this enterprise, it is certain that there will be at least twelve and possibly more. We are also assured that the program in 1964 and 1965 will constitute a considerable expansion. What I have described thus far could well amount to a need for one hundred linguists every summer and perhaps one-third of that number during the year. Remember, if you please, that this has to do merely with the retraining of English and foreign-language teachers now in the profession.

Of equal importance is the preservice training of teachers. Here our progress is somewhat slower, but nevertheless we are moving in the same direction. Colleges of education are using the joint appointment as a device to obtain the services of linguists in a teacher-training capacity. In other institutions, departments of linguistics are being organized, or linguists are being added to the departments of English and the foreign languages. It is almost possible to see a pattern in the way this is working throughout the country. In those parts of it where linguistics has not been strongly represented in the larger institutions, it is the universities that are concerning themselves with the development of some kind of program. In those areas where linguistics has flourished in the universities, the state colleges are now seeking to add it to their curricula.

A further instance of the great interest in our subject on the part of teachers is evident in the programs of the annual meetings of various organizations. At the 1962 meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, at least twenty of the forty-eight sections dealt with one aspect or another of linguistics. Gleason, Joos, McDavid, and Carroll addressed general sections of the conference. This proportion is not atypical; it represents quite fairly the direction that the organization has been taking over the past five years. At the meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, held just a month ago in Miami, 13 of the 60 section meetings were devoted wholly or in part to linguistic topics. In addition, there was a pre-convention workshop on 'Language, Linguistics, and the School Program', and also a meeting of the Commission on the English Language.

We must also take cognizance of another recent development which increases the amount of activity in our field, namely the considerable sums which are being poured into research. Much of this is in applied linguistics, but a considerable amount goes to support investigations into hitherto unrecorded and unanalyzed languages. Again, the NDEA looms large in the picture. Over the past three years, a little more than two hundred research projects have been approved. Included among those for which support was given for the fiscal year 1962 are a Hausa syntax, research on Kannada and Telugu, a grammar of Sango, and a Gujarati reference grammar. A contract for a comprehensive study of the Ural-Altaic languages has been made with the American Council of Learned Societies. In addition, there is the series of contrastive analyses of English contra German,

Spanish, French, Italian, and Russian which has been undertaken by the Center for Applied Linguistics. The important point is that money is available for projects for which no support, or at best a minimal amount, had been previously forthcoming.[6]

The story is very much the same with respect to research in English. It was originally hoped that, during the last session of Congress, NDEA might be extended to include English or that a comparable measure might be enacted. These expectations did not materialize. Despite this, we appear to be on the eve of a considerable amount of support for research through the mechanism of what is known as Project English. In September of 1961 Congress authorized the use of funds under Public Law 531 for the improvement of English instruction. These are administered by the Cooperative Research Branch of the U. S. Office of Education. At present, aid has already been extended to some six curriculum study centers and to approximately twenty more specific research projects.[7]

Although linguistic interests do not necessarily predominate in all of these, they are very strongly present. For example, a five-year grant to the University of Minnesota will support the preparation and evaluation of curricular materials for grades 7–12, based on language study. It will endeavor to create a language-centered curriculum in which students will learn systematically about the history, characteristics, structures, and uses of English. Included in the statement of purpose for the center at the University of Oregon, also a five-year project, is the following: 'The center will attempt ... to bring the content of the curriculum into harmony with the current state of knowledge about language, writing, the relation of speech to writing; and devise means for training teachers to teach the new materials.'

Of the twenty specific research projects already approved, at least five call upon the services of trained linguists. That at the University of Buffalo proposes 'the application of descriptive linguistics to the teaching of English and a statistically measured comparison of the relative effectiveness of the linguistically oriented and traditional methods of instruction'. The Westport, Connecticut, schools have been given a grant 'to identify the grammatical constructions needing most intensive study by junior high school students, to determine the contributions that linguistic scholarship can focus upon teaching of these constructions, and to prepare and evaluate appropriate lessons'. For some time this particular school system has been working toward a sequential program of linguistically oriented language instruction throughout the entire six years of the secondary school. Ohio State University will engage in a study of 'the effect of the knowledge of a generative grammar upon the growth of language complexity'. Projects of this nature will demand linguistically trained researchers and first-rate consultants or advisers.

I shall complete this spotty and necessarily incomplete survey with a very

[6] The most readily accessible source of information about NDEA research projects in foreign languages and linguistics is *The linguistic reporter*, newsletter of the Center for Applied Linguistics. The issues for December 1960, October 1961, August 1962, and October 1962 are of especial interest.

[7] Information concerning these is available in *Project English newsletter*, published by the U. S. Office of Education. So far two issues have appeared: no. 1 in May 1962 and no. 2 in September 1962.

brief statement concerning the teaching of English as a foreign language and as a second language. I have already made the comment that this is one type of language teaching which has, for the past twenty years, been committed to an essentially linguistic approach. It is no accident, but on the contrary nothing more than a reflection of present fact and past history, that one of the Fulbright selection committees bears the title, 'Linguistics and Teaching English as a Foreign Language'. Actually, seven separate agencies of the federal government are now engaged in such teaching. I shall have time to give you an idea of the scope of operation of just one of them.

During the fiscal year 1961, the United States Information Agency taught English to a total of 221,162 persons in six areas of the world. The number of teachers employed in this operation was 3,245. In addition, 141 workshops were organized for just short of nine thousand foreign teachers of English. This is just one agency of the seven, although admittedly the largest.

Let me remind you that this is no more than a partial survey of the tremendous amount of activity which has been stimulated by the growing acceptance of a scientific approach to the study of language and to language teaching. I have, for example, omitted all reference to foundation support of various projects. The entire movement has snowballed to such a degree that scarcely a single one of us is able to grasp it in its entirety. It constitutes an opportunity and a challenge (to use a trite but unavoidable term) both to our profession and to this organization. The question is how do we proceed to meet it?

There is little or no point in saying that this is none of our affair, that we neither created this situation nor asked for it, and that it imposes no obligation upon us to do anything about it. Such a reaction would constitute the height of futility. The truth is that we are faced with a situation, a series of facts, and an appalling need for vast numbers of trained people—a need that must be met as rapidly as possible. We may as well resign ourselves to the unpleasant circumstance that within the next decade some things will be done in the name of linguistics that will make us blush, and they will be done by persons whom we will not wish to own. The problem becomes not one of how to avoid these unpleasant developments but rather how to minimize them.

If one may distinguish between linguistics as a profession and the Linguistic Society of America as a learned body, I grant that this is a problem which faces us as a profession. Unfortunately, I know of no other organization which can appropriately speak for the profession, which is in a position to consider the problems that are facing it, or even to begin to think in terms of its collective future. And I am afraid that this will demand organized thinking, a collective approach rather than individual effort. It is true that as individuals many members of this Society have given generously of their time and their talents to the educational ventures I have described in some detail. But their very success has been responsible in part for the situation which we now face. We cannot, as a profession or as an organization, ignore a common obligation to devote a considerable amount of time and thought to the future of education in this country, the place of linguistics in it, and the potential direction in which the profession is to develop.

I fully realize the revolutionary and unpopular nature of what I am about to

propose. Despite Bloomfield's glance at contemporary education, in his essay entitled 'Why a Linguistic Society?', we have for years insisted upon maintaining this as an organization devoted to research, to the virtual exclusion of every other interest. Our publications policy reflects this attitude. So too, with an occasional exception does our practice with respect to accepting papers for our annual programs. I confess to a considerable amount of sympathy for this point of view. Speculation, the careful amassing and presentation of detail, the exploration of previously uncharted areas, the addition to the sum total of human knowledge—these are not only pleasant exercises of the intellect but they are in truth the very foundation of future progress in our science. Nevertheless I must maintain that to confine ourselves to these matters, fundamental as they are, is a luxury we can no longer afford. We won't like it, but as an organization we shall have to expand our concerns. A single committee on linguistics and education will no longer suffice. Neither can we hastily pass these matters off in the desperate hope that the Committee on Language Programs of the American Council of Learned Societies, the Center for Applied Linguistics, or some other organization will take care of them. They cannot.

Such a change of direction is not at all unusual in the history of development of a learned body. In 1925 the Modern Language Association was wholly committed to the publication of research and the presentation of research papers at its annual programs. Today the commitment of this organization to dealing with educational and pedagogical matters is enormous and is expanding year by year. The American Historical Association, also at its beginning wholly research-committed, takes an active interest in what is going on in the schools and colleges and makes every effort to extend direct help to teachers of history and social studies.

Certainly as far as we are concerned, a wide variety of problems are crying for a solution, and among them certain matters are in particular need of clarification. Of these, one of the most serious is the notion held rather widely that a short course of lectures, a book, or an article containing a series of definitions can indoctrinate someone sufficiently toward a linguistic approach, that all language teaching difficulties will immediately disappear and that teaching effectiveness will be miraculously increased five- or tenfold. This is what one of our colleagues has called the once-over-lightly treatment. It is a dangerous misconception and must be corrected.

In doing so we must insist on the one hand upon the recognition that linguistics is more than one set of terms replacing another, that linguistics has not abolished meaning in language, that a linguist may legitimately be concerned with language in its written as well as its spoken form. We must continually drive home the further point that linguistics constitutes, for most people, a totally new way of thinking about language, a new set of assumptions, a new way of working with it. At the same time, we must differentiate realistically among the total range of knowledge and experience which we expect today of a linguist whose responsibility it is to train others to do research, of a member of a college language department, of a curriculum supervisor for language arts in the elementary schools,

and of an educated layman. It would be sheer folly to assume that all of these must have the same range and extent of academic experience in our subject.

Practically speaking, it is not my intention to propose that either as an organization or as a profession we attempt to ride off madly in all directions. We must not become so dismayed by what I have just described that we flail about wildly on every side. My suggestion is minimal, but even so, in view of the past history of this organization it may well be looked upon either as revolutionary or nonsensical. Nor do I delude myself that it will meet with anything like complete acceptance—this time. But I hope that I have demonstrated that we cannot afford to be dilatory for even a relatively short period.

In essence what I propose is very simple. Let us concede that we all have scholarly concerns, and that these are not only important but dear to us. But we are also educators. Most of us teach; most of us teach linguistics in one form or another. Let us address ourselves to the problems, curricular and pedagogical, of making that teaching more effective, and of making it reach larger numbers of people. Certainly we must admit that there are problems here, that neither our courses nor our curricula are all as well organized as they might be. We must admit, as well, that not every one of us is a total master of classroom procedure. Few of us really know what goes on in institutions other than our own; many of us might profit from such information. We have in the past considered the discussion of research problems of mutual interest to be stimulating and helpful. Certainly the same logic and the same conclusions should apply to educational problems of common concern. Let me mention just a few of them.

A multitude of questions center about the undergraduate major in linguistics. I have already called attention to the relatively small number of institutions at which such programs are available, compared to those at the graduate level. We may well ask first of all whether there should be such a program. Or are we willing to settle for a student well prepared in two or three foreign languages? What about a student highly competent in just one? Should the undergraduate linguistics major acquire a depth of competence in a single language or a wide but slighter acquaintance with a number of them? What should be the level or depth of undergraduate courses in the tool subjects—the same as for the M.A. or more elementary? What would constitute acceptable cognate or allied subjects? I have no set of ready and quick answers for these questions. I would value the opinions and an account of the experience of others who have been engaged in teaching linguistics to undergraduates. But where do I have the opportunity to hear them?

In another connection I have already posed the problem of the amount of information about language and linguistics which the educated layman should possess. This in turn raises other questions. On the college level it suggests that possibly an underclass course in language or linguistics might well be an optional or even a required portion of a general-education program. If so, what should be the possible content and approach?—and here let me emphasize that I am not looking for a single answer or a dogma. For elementary- and secondary-school students this brings to our attention the proposal that Mortimer Graves has made

consistently over the past six or seven years. He has taken the point of view that during the next three or four decades everyone who is above an absolutely menial level of existence will have to be multilingual. He points out that it will be impossible to prophesy during the child's elementary schooling the three or four languages that circumstances will force him to learn. He proposes therefore some kind of training in the structure of language and in ways of learning language for every student in the schools. It is interesting but also a rather sad commentary that not one of the foundations interested in exploring this as an educational possibility approached the Linguistic Society for its considered opinion.

Are we so satisfied with our graduate programs that we feel no need for discussion among ourselves as to their content? Certainly we are faced with the same dilemma which confronts our colleagues in English and in the foreign languages, that of reconciling depth with breadth, the contradictory concepts of the dissertation as an exercise in scholarly method versus a significant new discovery or advance in knowledge, the equally confusing concepts of the function of the master's degree. Should it be a baby doctorate, a consolation prize for the hopeless, or a self-contained program in its own right?

I feel that these are vastly important questions, and in the interest of time I have neither fully developed those which I hurriedly mentioned nor have I included the dozens which arise in connection with specific courses.

What, for example, is the optimum proportion of problem-solving to presentation of principle in the various linguistics tool courses? And let us not accept the easy assumption that the answer for each of the tool courses will necessarily be the same. The suggestion has been made in various quarters that an introductory course in linguistics might be programmed. Has anyone tried it, or is anyone about to? If the former, what have been the results?

Given a limited amount of time for a course in the structure of English, how much of the beginning of it should be devoted to phonology? Often it is rather difficult to motivate this at the outset. Or could one begin with morphophonemics or morphology and let the phonology be absorbed incidentally?

In teaching a course in one of the older languages or periods of a language, to what extent do we still try to cram all of the grammar down the students' throats during the first three or four weeks and then turn to reading and translation for a haphazard illustration of the morphology and syntax that has been swallowed but not digested? To what extent do we depend upon a grammar-translation procedure much like a conventional foreign-language text? On oral drill to secure immediate recognition of inflections and syntactical patterns? Has anyone thought of employing contrastive analysis to identify points of difficulty in presentation, as we do with foreign languages? To what extent has the history of English or German, for example, been presented in modern structural terms? How much do we know about valid testing procedures for any of these bodies of knowledge we are engaged in teaching?

I cannot convince myself that the questions that I have raised are so trifling and unimportant, so devoid of interest to those who spend a considerable share of their waking hours in teaching linguistics and in training the next generation of linguists, that they would not welcome a regular or even an occasional op-

portunity to discuss them. Indeed, because of everything that I pointed out at the beginning of this discussion with reference to the rapidly mounting interest in linguistics and the need for linguists, I am convinced that they are of paramount importance.

But where is the forum? Where is the place to discuss them? Whose is the responsibility to provide it? Can anyone here in all honesty suggest that this responsibility is not ours? Can anyone sincerely argue the case that any other organization or group has a greater responsibility than we do? Admittedly, I am not now prepared to propose a specific plan for bringing this about. I would be overstepping my prerogatives as an individual member of this organization if I were to do so. I not only suggest but I insist that the provision of such a forum, such an opportunity is a collective responsibility which devolves upon all of us. True enough, even given this commitment to the discussion of pedagogical and curricular questions, we shall not solve all the problems which face us and which will continue to confront us in increasing numbers and magnitude, but by means of so doing we can take an initial step toward their alleviation.

Bloomfield's essay, which I have already drawn upon liberally, provides me with a more eloquent conclusion than I could possibly have formulated myself. 'Not only the furtherance of our science but also the needs of our society make it the duty of students of language to work together systematically and with that sense of craftsmanship and of obligation which is called professional consciousness.' We need merely to add to this the final line from Chaucer's description of the Clerk of Oxenford, 'Gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche', to arrive at a just concept of the scope of what the man whom we so revere referred to as 'the sense of craftsmanship and obligation which is called professional consciousness'. And now to add Bloomfield's concluding sentence: 'For this, then, [we] need a Linguistic Society.'